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Thursday, November 19
1:30 pm–3:00 pm
Southern Hemisphere I (D)
Supported by The Publications Committee

Chair: Peter Lichtenberg, PhD,
Publications Committee Chair

Podium Presentations:
Stephen B. Kritchevsky, PhD, Editor-in-Chief, The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Medical Sciences
Bob Knight, PhD, Editor-in-Chief, The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences

Breakout Sessions: Editors of The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Medical Sciences; The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences; The Gerontologist; Public Policy & Aging Report

Program Overview
This session is designed for anyone who would like to learn more about how to get published in peer-reviewed journals in the field of aging. Emerging scholars and professionals will find this symposium especially useful. This session will be divided into two parts: (1) podium presentations by the editors-in-chief of two GSA journals; and (2) breakout sessions with editors from each journal. Participants will have an opportunity to meet informally with editors from GSA and AGHE journals and ask specific questions about getting published. Participants will be encouraged to visit as many journal editors as they wish during this component of the session.

Session Objectives
After attending this session, participants will be able to do the following:
1. Select an appropriate journal and write to the specifications of that journal.
2. Explain what happens to a manuscript from submission to acceptance to publication.
3. Respond to reviewer comments when a manuscript is returned for revision and resubmission.

Agenda

5 minutes  Welcome and Introductions
Overview of the GSA and AGHE Journals
Peter Lichtenberg, PhD, Publications Committee Chair

30 minutes  Podium Presentations and Q&A

Stephen B. Kritchevsky, PhD, Editor-in-Chief
The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Medical Sciences

Bob Knight, PhD, Editor-in-Chief
The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences
Agenda (continued)

Getting Ready to Publish
Editors of The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Medical Sciences and The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences will be presenting this first part of the program. They will discuss manuscript development and journal targeting to optimize the chances for timely acceptance and the wide dissemination of your research results to an audience most likely to appreciate your work. Options for publication have increased tremendously over the previous decade, making the targeting of appropriate journals more difficult. The symposium will discuss the pros and cons of different types of publications to help authors make better selections.

Podium Presentation and Q&A (Cont’d)

Peter Lichtenberg, PhD, Publications Committee chair

Publishing From Two Perspectives
The second part of the symposium will examine publishing from the perspectives of both authors and editors. The presenters will highlight the importance of writing for a specific journal and following the journal’s instructions to authors. The discussion will cover the importance of writing well and avoiding self-plagiarism. Authors will gain an understanding of how to make decisions about each aspect of an article, including its title, abstract, introduction, methods section, results section, discussion section, and conclusion. Panelists also will discuss how editorial decisions are made, describe strategies that authors can use to increase the likelihood of gaining acceptance for their work, and outline commonly made errors. Editors and associate editors from GSA and AGHE journals will be discussing these issues with the participants.

10 minutes Editor Introductions
Peter Lichtenberg, PhD, Publications Committee Chair

40 minutes Journal Breakouts
Timekeeper: Peter Lichtenberg, PhD, Publications Committee Chair
➢ The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Medical Sciences
  o Stephen B. Kritchevsky, PhD, Editor-in-Chief
➢ The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences
  o Bob Knight, PhD, Editor-in-Chief
  o Nicole Anderson, PhD, Associate Editor
  o Shevaun Neupert, PhD, Associate Editor
➢ The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Social Sciences
  o Deborah Carr, PhD, Editor-in-Chief
  o Philippa Clarke, PhD, Associate Editor
  o Jessica Kelley-Moore, PhD, Associate Editor
  o Jill Suitor, PhD, Associate Editor
➢ The Gerontologist
  o Rachel Pruchno, PhD, Editor-in-Chief
  o Barbara J. Bowers, PhD, RN, FAAN, Editor: Qualitative Research
  o Suzanne Meeks, PhD, Editor: Practice Concepts
➢ Public Policy & Aging Report
  o Greg O’Neill, PhD, Associate Editor
➢ GSA Editorial Offices
  o Megan McCutcheon, Kathy Jackson, Amy Conradt

5 minutes Closing Remarks
Peter Lichtenberg, PhD, Publications Committee Chair

Materials will be placed online for member access after the annual scientific meeting.
The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Biological Sciences publishes articles on the biological aspects of aging in areas such as biochemistry, biodemography, cellular and molecular biology, comparative and evolutionary biology, endocrinology, exercise science, genetics, immunology, morphology, neuroscience, nutrition, pathology, pharmacology, physiology, vertebrate and invertebrate genetics and biological underpinnings of late life diseases.

The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Medical Sciences publishes articles representing the full range of medical sciences pertaining to aging. Appropriate areas include, but are not limited to, basic medical sciences, clinical epidemiology, clinical research, and health services research from professions such as medicine, dentistry, allied health sciences, and nursing.

- Instructions to Authors: oxford.ly/GA_ITAs

The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences publishes articles on development in adulthood and old age that advance the psychological science of aging processes and outcomes. Articles in this journal have clear implications for theoretical or methodological innovation in the psychology of aging or contribute significantly to the empirical understanding of psychological processes and aging. Areas of interest include, but are not limited to, attitudes, clinical applications, cognition, education, emotion, health, human factors, interpersonal relations, neuropsychology, perception, personality, physiological psychology, social psychology, and sensation. Applied research with theoretical significance is welcome. Manuscripts reporting work that relates behavioral aging to neighboring disciplines are also appropriate.

The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Social Sciences publishes articles using a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches encompassing quantitative, qualitative, experimental, and nonexperimental research. Authors are encouraged to submit papers in areas such as anthropology, demography, economics, epidemiology, geography, health services research, political science, public health, social history, social work, and sociology.

- Instructions to Authors: oxford.ly/GB_ITAs
The Gerontologist, published since 1961, provides a multidisciplinary perspective on human aging through the publication of research and analysis in gerontology, including social policy, program development, and service delivery. It reflects and informs the broad community of disciplines and professions involved in understanding the aging process and providing service to older people. Articles, including those in applied research, report concepts and research findings with implications for policy or practice. Contributions from social and psychological sciences, biomedical and health sciences, political science and public policy, economics, education, law, and the humanities are welcome.

- Instructions to Authors: oxford.ly/TG_ITAs

Public Policy & Aging Report, published quarterly, explores policy issues generated by the aging of society. Each thematic issue is designed to stimulate debate, highlight emerging concerns, and propose alternative policy options. Recent issues have addressed legal and policy issues associated with end-of-life care; technology and aging; income security among older populations of color; Medicare reform; and elder abuse and neglect. The audience consists of decision makers in the public and private sectors, advisors and staff to those decision makers, program administrators, researchers, students, and the interested public. Articles in each issue are informed, to the point, and provocative. Authors are drawn from the leadership ranks of the policy, practice, and research communities. In Public Policy & Aging Report, these authors are afforded the opportunity to engage readers in a more timely and pressing manner than is afforded through most other publication formats.

- Instructions to Authors: oxford.ly/PP_ITAs

Gerontology & Geriatrics Education, the official journal of the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education, is a peer-reviewed journal that focuses on the exchange of information related to research, curriculum development, course and program evaluation, classroom and practice innovation, and other topics with educational implications for gerontology and geriatrics. This publication is designed to appeal to a broad range of readers, including faculty, students, practitioners, administrators, and policy makers and it is dedicated to disseminating cutting-edge and evidence-based knowledge in the field of gerontology and geriatrics education.

- Instructions to Authors: tandfonline.com/toc/wgge20/current#.VEarJkpX-uY
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Peter Lichtenberg, PhD
Chair, GSA Publications Committee

Stephen B. Kritchevsky, PhD
Editor-In-Chief, The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Medical Sciences

Bob G. Knight, PhD
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Strategies for Publishing in Scientific Peer-Reviewed Journals

Stephen B. Kritchevsky, PhD
Wake Forest School of Medicine
Editor, *The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Medical Sciences*
The Journals of Gerontology: Series A is a monthly journal of The Gerontological Society of America. The Medical Sciences section of the Journal publishes articles representing the full range of medical sciences pertaining to aging.

Five types of contributions are included in the section:

- Original Research Reports.
- Brief Reports.
- Review Articles.
- Guest Editorials.
- Letters to the Editor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Impact Factor*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journals of Gerontology: Series A</td>
<td>5.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the American Geriatrics Society</td>
<td>4.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry</td>
<td>4.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gerontologist</td>
<td>3.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals of Gerontology: Series B</td>
<td>3.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and Aging</td>
<td>2.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Psychogeriatrics</td>
<td>2.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geriatrics &amp; Gerontology International</td>
<td>2.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Aging and Physical Activity</td>
<td>1.966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2014 Journal Citation Reports Social Science Edition, Gerontology Category, Thomson Reuters
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Before you write the paper

- Does this paper advance an important conversation in the literature? Does it,
  - Test an important hypothesis for the first time?
  - Replicate a finding in a way that extends the conversation?
  - Point out the importance of a problem that has been understudied or unrecognized?

**Reasons for Rejection**
The paper is only descriptive and tests no hypotheses nor challenges any widely held beliefs. Paper replicates a well-known finding.
Useful Replications

- Better evidence to support old claims / confirm unsupported claims / test assumptions
  - Case series to prospective study to randomized trial
  - Much bigger samples
  - Ability to rule out important alternative explanations
- Failure to replicate preliminary reports of high significance
- Extend findings in useful ways
  - Do findings apply across the natural history of a condition?

Reason for Rejection
The sole reason for the paper appears to be the replication of a well-known finding in a new country.
The importance of writing well

- Reviewers take the quality of writing as a sign of the quality of science.
  - If possible, have your article edited (or translated) by a scientific editor skilled in the English language.
  - Journal editors and reviewers may not have the time / resources to help.

Reason for Rejection
The paper is so difficult to read that the scientific message is lost.
Choosing a Journal

- **Fit-based decision**: What journals are you citing? This could be a good indication that your research is in the right “camp”, establish scholarly continuity, and better insure that the reviewers will be familiar with the ideas and jargon of your article.

- **Audience-based**: Who reads the journal? Your discipline, multi-disciplinary audience (based on theme), professional organization with built-in audience that sponsors the journal.
Choosing a Journal

- Methodological preferences of journal: quantitative vs. qualitative, mixed methods
- Theoretical orientation and emphasis. Does theory take a front seat or back-seat? Is the journal more theory-based or applied?
- Communicate with editors directly about your topic and approach, they are more than willing to provide feedback,
- Seek out editors at professional meetings and workshops
Writing for a specific journal

- Read previous articles for clues regarding the format of articles, the length of particular sections, kinds of study designs & statistics that may be expected, the format of tables and figures.
- Read and follow the *Instructions for Authors* closely.
  - Kinds of articles
  - Allowable length
  - Reference style
  - Availability of on-line only material.
Quality Control

- The abstract is critical to get past immediate rejection.
- The introduction is key and establishes the roadmap for what’s to come...spend more time on this!
- Does your review of the literature support your research questions, the grounds for your study and hypotheses?
- Does the method section offer adequate information for the reader to know how you did your study?
- Are your analyses appropriate to your research question? Are they targeted at the research questions, do they make the most of your data?
- Were your analyses conducted correctly? Double-check.
Quality Control

- Does your discussion section explain whether your hypotheses were supported?
- Does your discussion section refer back to the relevant literature and explain how your study enhances it?
- Does your discussion list shortcomings of the research?
- Does your discussion provide a conclusion that is well-supported by the data presented?

Reason for Rejection
The paper draws conclusions that aren’t supported by the study design. For example, assuming that a relationship found in a cross-sectional study represents a causal relationship indicates the author’s poor understanding of scientific reasoning.
Scholarly peer review (also known as refereeing) is the process of subjecting an author's scholarly work, research, or ideas to the scrutiny of others who are experts in the same field, before a paper describing this work is published in a journal.

Reviews have two purposes:
- Provide input to editor in making decision (gatekeeper)
- Provide constructive advice to authors (evaluation)

Longer critiques often come from better articles.
Reviews and letter from editor

- Comments may be either in chronological order of the paper presentation or based on level of importance
- Where possible consolidate points by reviewers
- Where reviewers disagree, make your case and support it.
- Copy revised text from the article into your response letter to show how you addressed the reviewer’s concerns.
Your mission is to get your foot in the door (Revise & Resubmit)

- Do you cite articles from the journal to which you are submitting?
- Don’t try too hard, being grandiose in the intended contribution can damage your chances. A junior scholar should strive to be conservative but creative.
- Tradeoff between merits and faults of the research adequately demonstrated.
- More leniency given to “frontier” areas, where data are less readily available

- Nine reasons why manuscripts are frequently rejected
  - Results are implausible
  - There’s nothing new here
  - There are alternative explanations
  - It’s too complex
  - There’s a problem with methodology (or statistics)
  - Incapable of falsification
  - The reasoning is circular
  - For applied journals, policy and practice implications not well articulated
  - I am making value judgments
Writing for Publication

Bob G. Knight, Ph.D.
Editor, *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences*

Symposium at GSA
Orlando, 2015
Choosing a Journal: Content Issues

- What conversation are you joining?
- Who is your audience?
- Will your methods be appreciated?
- What is the culture of the journal:
  - What types of articles do they publish? Theory? Empirical articles?
  - Disciplinary or multidisciplinary focus?

DO YOUR HOMEWORK: READ THE JOURNALS!
Choosing a Journal

• **Fit-based decision:** What journals are *you* citing? This could be a good indication that your research is in the right “camp”, establish scholarly continuity, and better insure that the reviewers will be familiar with the ideas and jargon of your article.

• **Audience-based:** Who reads the journal? Your discipline, multi-disciplinary audience (based on theme), professional organization with built-in audience that sponsors the journal.
Choosing a Journal

- Methodological preferences of journal: quantitative vs. qualitative, mixed methods
- Theoretical orientation and emphasis. Does theory take a front seat or back-seat? Is the journal more theory-based or applied?
- Communicate with editors directly about your topic and approach, they are more than willing to provide feedback,
- Seek out editors at professional meetings and workshops
Writing for a specific journal

• Read previous articles for clues regarding the format of articles, the length of particular sections, kinds of study designs & statistics that may be expected, the format of tables and figures.
• Read and follow the *Instructions for Authors* closely.
  ▫ Kinds of articles
  ▫ Allowable length
  ▫ Reference style
  ▫ Availability of on-line only material.
“You’re Only Human”

• Truisms:
  ▫ Anyone who has ever published has been rejected.
  ▫ Rejection hurts.
  ▫ Rejection is part of the scientific process.
The most common reason for immediate rejection is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem:</th>
<th>Solution:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Paper is not consistent with the mission of our journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A common reason for immediate rejection of international submissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not really psychological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practice rather than science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Simplistic statistics (t tests, chi square)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Better News: Revise and Resubmit
Managing Your Reaction to the Review

• There will be criticism and requests for revision
• You will have a negative emotional reaction to it
• Plan for this, allow time for it
• Come back to the review after you have calmed down
Understanding the Review:

- There will be criticism and requests for revisions
- Overcome the “undergraduate mind” that tells you this means you did a bad job or they hated the paper
- The goal is to get published and to have the best possible version of your paper
- The reviewers are on your side in doing this
- Reviewers (and editors) are authors too
Understanding the Review (continued)

• Depersonalize the text: I have found it helpful to put a paper of mine under a pile of reviews to do or papers to grade and come to it with that mindset.
• Assume the reviewers are right. What can be done to fix the issues?
• This is true even when they make mistakes about what your paper has in it: The question then becomes “Why wasn’t this clear to them?”
Potential “Filters” in Understanding Reviewer Comments

• If you perceive US journal standards as quite high, do not assume criticism means you failed to meet the standard. A revision request means publication in the journal is possible.

• Do not give up if your English/writing style is criticized; but DO get expert help in polishing your prose.
Potential “Filters” (continued)

- Read the journal before submitting and think about fit in terms of content and methodology. Most common reason for immediate rejection of papers is poor fit.
- For JG:PS, one psychological variable does not make it a psychological paper
- JG:PS is not a clinical practice oriented journal
What if the reviewer is REALLY wrong?

- You may get criticized from a different theoretical, methodological, or analytic position entirely (Note: The editor MAY imply this in the decision letter.)
- The reviewer may just really misunderstand what you did
- It is POSSIBLE to argue this in cover letter to the editor
- BUT, you’re not likely to get more than one of these per paper
- If you’re arguing this for multiple points, give up and submit elsewhere
- Don’t make a habit of this
The cover letter

• Respond to the points made by the editor and the reviewers
• Don’t miss additional revisions from the editor
• Respond to every major point (not copyedits)
• Say where in text your change is and what it is
• Your response should be proportional to the point made: big changes for big points
• Some expression of your positive response and thankfulness for the review is fine. Don’t overdo it.
• Do not be argumentative or angry even if you are disputing a point.
Summary, Closing Remarks, Questions